



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,475	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.322-US-01	3199
55895	7590	03/12/2008		
GATES & COOPER LLP			EXAMINER	
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER			KUMAR, ANIL, N	
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,475	Applicant(s) GARCIA ET AL.
	Examiner ANIL N. KUMAR	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/4/2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date:
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on January 4th, 2008. Claims (1-18) are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. ("Bonney", US 6,466,953 B1) in view of Shema et al. ("Shema", US 2002/0194190 A1).

Claim 1: Bonney teach, A method for operating a graphics program in a computer (Fig. 8), comprising:

- performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program (while described in terms of "sheets," the present invention is not limited to use with CAD sheets, and can be used with other types of objects, col 3/4 lines 65-7 and Fig. 2),

- (a) wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages a one or more Sheet Sets (organizational and management of hierarchical relationships sheets, col 1 lines 10-14), each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view (generates objects of the drawing sheets, col 3/4 lines 65-7 and Fig.2),

but does not explicitly teach,

- (b) and wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows users to place callouts on the Sheets directly from a window of the Sheet set Manager showing a logical structure for the Sheet Sets in visual form.

However, Shema teach, a method, computer program product, and system for creating and viewing an intelligent graphics file including parts information, and further depicts an embodiment of the present invention displaying a graphic representation of an article on one of a plurality of sheets within a drawing set (paragraph [0054] and Fig. 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Shema's teaching with in Bonney, to find callout features directly from a visual file structure in the same window, in Bonney, in order to help the user to find the callout features easily, and to visualize the impact of placing the callouts of the document, more effectively.

Claim 2: Bonney teach, wherein the callouts indicate which Sheet or View to display for additional information (Fig. 4).

Claim 3: Bonney teach, wherein the Sheet Set Manager automatically creates fields that display appropriate labels when the callouts are placed on the Sheets (links descriptive fields in one or more icons, col 3 lines 2-15 Fig. 4).

Claim 4: Bonney teach, wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows users to place callouts on the Sheets before a referenced Sheet or View has been defined. Official Notice is taken that the use of placing callouts/icons is well known in the art, especially in linking/referencing an object. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to allow the user to place a callout/icon with or without a placeholder, as it is the most convenient and efficient way for the user to use a CAD tool (See Shema).

Claim 5: Bonney teach, wherein the Sheet Set Manager automatically updates the callouts (update icons automatically, col 3 lines 2-15 Fig. 4).

Claim 6: Bonney teach, wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows users to create collections of callouts. Official Notice is taken that the creation of a group or a collection of callouts/icons is well known in the art, especially in linking/referencing a set of objects. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to allow the user to create a group or collection of

callouts/icons that can be repeated reused, as it is the most convenient and efficient way for the user to use a CAD tool (See Shema..

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Bonney further teach, apparatus used in CAD environment (Fig. 1).

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 2, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 3, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 4, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 6, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore rejected under similar rationale. Bonney further teach, program instructions are to be provided from a storage device such as CD-ROM (col 3 line 52-62).

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 2, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 3, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 4, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 5, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 6, and therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on January 4th, 2008 have been fully considered but they were found not persuasive.

A. Applicant argues, "Instead, these portions of Bonney merely describe a user drawing icons on a display device to represent sheets, not callouts. Moreover, nothing in these portions of Bonney refer to users placing callouts on sheets directly from a window of the Sheet Set Manage~ showing ~ logical structure for the Sheet Sets in visual form. Consequently, Bonney does not teach or suggest these limitations". The Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection, and points out, this is moot in view of new rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil N. Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 270-1693. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesdays and alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri EST (Alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANK

2/22/2008

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174